Crossing Perceived Cultural Barriers in a Taiwanese College EFL Classroom

Paul C. Talley, PhD
I- Shou University
International College
Department of International Business Administration
No. 1, Section 1, Syuecheng Road
Dashu District
Kaohsiung, 84001
Taiwan, R.O.C

Tu, Hui-ling
Tajen University
Department of Applied Foreign Languages
No. 20, Weisin Road
Sin-erVillage, Yanpu Township
Pingtung County (907)
Taiwan, R.O.C

Abstract

The relationship between second-language learning and culture has been studied and debated by educators and students alike. In an EFL context, students' language learning happens mainly in a language classroom where the learning culture predominates. Learning behaviors are normally shaped by pre-existing attitudes, values and beliefs regarding what constitutes good learning and effective teaching. In such an environment, a real cultural barrier may exist as a set of cultural differences between teacher and students. To determine how crossing perceived cultural barriers in a Taiwanese college EFL classroom might affect language learning, fifty-three non-English majors from two EFL communication classes answered a partial questionnaire specific to cultural barriers and a teaching program called CSESP. Analysis of the programinvolving one control group (CG) and one experimental group (EG) indicates that it provided both learner groups with an opportunity to realign their initial response to English speaking in an intercultural classroom context.

Keywords: cultural barriers, socialization, target culture, intercultural competence

1. Introduction

In order to overcome potential cultural barriers that students learning English may encounter in their future employment, EFL teachers must measure student performance to ascertain if students initially possess sufficient intercultural competence. Teachers should consider how individual differences (i.e. participation and inhibition) in English speaking performance will affect their students' overall language learning. One of the primary socio-linguistic differences exhibited between Asian and western language students is in their pattern of participatory behavior and characteristic reticence.

The cultural differences evident between Asia and the west requireEFL teachers to implement different instructional styles in given settings to remain effective. Cultural differences in the EFL classroom included a lack of shared fluency, pervasive classroom reticence, and deficient communicative competency, which were all strongly influenced by the teacher-based interaction strategies in use in Asia (Lee, & Ng, 2010). In a study of Asian students learning in communicative approach classrooms, Liu (2001) determined that these participants were significantly held back from active classroom interaction in their content courses by their socio-cultural backgrounds coupled with affective and linguistic constraints.

Increasingly, language programs strive to develop students' tolerance and understanding of other cultures, and hence, their ability to function in an international and intercultural context. Furthermore, Black (2004), among other scholars, suggested that future tourism and hospitality-focused language programs will become multinational, and more importantly to this study, multicultural.In addition, intercultural competence is the "knowledge, skills, and abilities to participate in activities where the target language is the primary communicative code and in situations where it is the common code for those with different preferred languages" (Byram, 1997; cited in Hall, & Verplaeste, 2000, p. 109).Intercultural competence "involves the ability to communicate in all types of encounters regardless of the specific cultural context"(Kim, 1991, p. 99). Included in this context is the knowledge necessary to manage differences between communicators, cultural and otherwise, and the ability to deal with accompanying uncertainty and stress. This knowledge is important because it helps increase tolerance of strangers, promotes the goal of foreign language learning, and furthers an appreciation of differences among disparate cultural groups.

Cross-cultural barriers result in difficulties for people to communicate with others of different cultures. According to McDermott and Gospodinoff (1981) differences in language and culture may not necessarily lead to a misunderstanding or conflict in the classroom; however, it is understood that cultural barriers will form the "boundaries" and "borders" of a classroom's micro-politics. For instance, Fu (1991) claimed that Asian teachers have more authority in teaching situations than western teachers have in the classroom which greatly affects accessibility. Similarly, Upton (1989) characterized western teachers as informal facilitators and coaches who used humor and originality during their classroom instruction.

Although there is no clear one-to-one relationship between one's language and one's cultural identity, language remains *the* most sensitive indicator with regards to the relationship between the individual (i.e., student) and a given social group (i.e., classroom) (Kramsch, 1998). This relationship, in either regard, encompasses an understanding of the many cultural barriers that EFL students may face in the classroom while trying to learn English.

2. Culture and Language Learning

The definition of culture in foreign language learning encompasses strong intercultural aspects since it involves acquiring a second language across the political boundaries of other nation-states. Since English is no longer restricted to western cultural contexts (Kachru, & Nelson, 2007), it should be expected that foreign language learning becomes a normal part of one's education and characterizes the individual. The language learning classroom focuses students' intercultural competence to communicative ends by developing self-identity, awareness of others' identities, and by stabilizing social change (Cortazzi, & Jin, 1999). So, students are expected to develop intercultural competence as a skill in addition to the four traditional skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

In a EFL classroom context, students' language learning happens whenever the culture of learning must be attended to. As such, students' learning behaviors are principally shaped by their pre-existing attitudes, values, and beliefs about what constitutes good learning and effective teaching. It should be noted that these influences bear specific cultural properties (Cortazzi, & Jin, 1996). In an Asian cultural setting, students tend to be socialized into a particular culture of learning which emphasizes discipline, attention, diligence, note-taking, clarity, hierarchical structures, and rote forms of memorization (ibid.). The roles of both students and teachers are well defined by traditional standards of conduct. Students are taught to be submissive to teacher authority, and teachers are supposed to transmit knowledge and to be responsible for students' learning (On, 1996). The kind of ready engagement and interaction with both teacher and classroom peers may be an uncomfortable experience for Asian students unaccustomed to such communicative language teaching approaches and practices (Liu, 2001).

According to Breen (2001), the language classroom may be seen as its own unique culture with an emphasis on contextual social and cognitive variables related to language learning. Certain key assumptions can be made about features relevant to classroom communication, principally that any cultural aspect in a language classroom is interactive. Learners benefit from learning together, and learning is based on the willingness and capability to forego inhibitions and engage in "stimulated communication within classroom-specific interaction" (ibid., p. 129). The culture of the language classroom is collective and jointly constructed by teachers and students alike. Lessons evolve dynamically from the class' explicit and implicit negotiation of the content material and social interactions and from the teacher's advance planning.

The notion of the classroom comprising a culture is approved by Hall (1999), who regarded it as a socio-cultural community based on shared goals, shared resources, and shared patterns and norms for participating as legitimate members of that community of learning.

Parry and Su (1998) suggested that students be actively involved in the process, because such involvement cannot be taken for granted, it is the responsibility of the teachers to stimulate it. Therefore, the culture of the classroom should encourage students to discover information rather than given it (Duckworth, 1987), so that emphasis should be placed on student initiative and autonomy (Stevick, 1976).Culture and language learning are closely aligned since language expresses cultural reality (Kramsch, 1993). Through the daily construction and social organization of classroom discussion, students can create dialogues with others that will test their choice of "frames and footings" (ibid., p. 51) in a shared context. Despite the fact that a collaborative classroom setting affords language students ample opportunities for further language development, significant cultural barriers remain as obstacles for Taiwanese EFL students.

3. Cultural Barriers for Taiwanese EFL Students

Although there is no clear one-to-one relationship between one's language and one's cultural identity, language remains *the* most sensitive indicator with regards to the relationship between the individual and a given social group (Kramsch, 1998). This relationship, in either regard, language or identity, encompasses many of the cultural barriers that Taiwanese EFL students may face in the classroom while trying to learn English. Encountering the nexus between language learning and culture presents some unique challenges to young language learners. Inasmuch, students often experience cultural barriers in their process of adjustment to the host educational environment in three significant ways: (a) acculturation, (b) culture shock, and (c) social distance.

First, acculturation is considered as a type of assimilation that will occur whenever a minority individual or group first arrives in a host environment (Gordon, 1964). According to Gordon, acculturation may take place regardless of simultaneous sub-assimilation (i.e. cultural or behavioral, structural, material, identificational, attitude receptional, behavioral, and civic) taking place. For example, foreign students can strive to acculturate in a host educational setting by learning a non-native language within a foreign cultural context and then behave accordingly. This means that acculturation may be thought of as the final goal, or barrier, of cross-cultural adaptation into the new learning experience of the EFL classroom. However, Teske and Nelson (1974) pinpointed that acculturation provided that the goal of complete assimilation into a given culture was neither a necessity, nor was it inevitable. Sometimes, acculturation would be met with resistance because of its considerable influence and threat to the student's native cultural identity. Accordingly, acculturation formed a major cultural barrier to students attempting to learn a foreign language. Kim's (1992) theory of acculturation indicates the importance of communication to the acculturation process. In the theory, intercultural identity was used to identify an individual's ability to grow beyond their original culture and to encompass a new culture, gaining additional insight into both cultures in the process. To be specific, acculturation and intercultural identity described communication as the mediating process to facilitate the transition from one culture to the next. Kim (1992) maintained that increasing interpersonal communication within the new host environment will result in increased acculturation. In order to accomplish interpersonal communication within the host community of the new target culture, language competence is necessary.

Second, a student's introduction to a new cultural learning may result in either an attempt at communication or in the formation of a cultural barrier. Communication bridges cultural gaps and results in shared opportunities for teachers and students to learn and then to adapt to mutually agreeable levels of linguistic and social understanding in the EFL classroom. Culture shock results when there is a level of "anxiety that results from losing all of our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse" (Oberg, 1960, p. 177). It may occur whenever cultural dislocation and the "foreignness" of the learning context initiates in a cultural conflict for the student. Inevitably, culture shock heightens emotional sensitivity in the learner, a failure to adapt, or in both. When students are plunged into an unfamiliar culture and then surrounded by unfamiliar language they will usually experience some degree of culture shock. These uncomfortable situations will be associated with a variety of negative feelings that may range from emotional irritation to outright physical illness (Adler, 1972). The first-hand experience of culture shock inevitably causes students to adapt to the formation of cultural barriers that are at times both contextual and oppositional to one another (Kim, 2001).

A third cultural barrier that may result from social distance which demonstrates a user's social standing that is comparatively similar or contrastively different from others in one's relative peer group. Feelings of social distance influence students' personal communications and may affect the way to learn a language in a host country or even within their own country (Richards, & Schmidt, 2002). Social distance is determined by various factors, including the learner's ethnicity, political status, economic status, social status, or minority vs. majority status within the learning environment. It should be noted that Oxford (1990) proposed a list of social and affective strategies for language learners to adopt in order to control social distance in the learning situation.

Some cultural barriers are more complex and require further examination. Learning a foreign language is not easy because of the adequate amount of personal adaptationrequired. For example, EFL students frequently encounter a change in their new teacher's fundamental approach to classroom instruction and in the culture of learning they may have been accustomed to back home. Littlewood (1981) explained that the ubiquitous idea of the CLT approach found in western classrooms may conflict with certain pre-existing cultural notions students may harbor about supposed teachers' roles and appropriate teaching methods. Karava-Doukas (1996) indicated that the mismatch between the teachers' beliefs and western classroom practices may yet be attributable. A mismatch may exist because the teacher did not examine the EFL students' attitudes prior to implementing new classroom instructional approaches that are outside their students' cultural frame.

It is with greater frequency that Taiwanese students and teachers alike encounter cultural barriers while learning and teaching English. Tsai (2007) indicated that the traditional Confucian pedagogy in Taiwan's education system discouraged EFL students to communicate in English since test-oriented grammar and reading skills were of more immediate concern to learn than content knowledge. As such, it is understandable that Taiwanese students will focus on form and content but not upon the content in the texts. Ting-Toomey (1985) indicated that Asian students from high-context cultures experience barriers to understanding from a collective or traditional expectation of what is acceptable as classroom behavior. On the other hand, western teachers from low-context cultures experience barriers to understanding and potential conflicts whenever their individual normative expectations of acceptable classroom behaviors are violated. As such, Asian EFL students often interact on a completely different level than western teachers might presently understand or appreciate. In Asian culture, open confrontation is to be avoided, risk is to be avoided, and uncertainty is to be avoided (ibid.). As a result, it is felt that it is the responsibility of students from high-context cultures to overcome their own cultural barriers if they are to achieve their goal of language in low-context cultural environments.

It should not be ignored that some of the cultural barriers that EFL students experience may be somewhat disagreeable since they can be influential, paradigmatic, institutional, stereotypical and even hyper-localized to the classroom setting and learning (Kim, 1997).In the case of the international college EFL classroom, the forms of cultural barriers that EFL students are most likely to face involve the paradigmatic and stereotypical. In the Taiwanese paradigm, the host environment of a western EFL classroom where the CLT approach tends to govern communicative norms of behavior and assessment (Kim, 2001). This choice of a learning context means that EFL students are required to conform to western (low-context) teaching or learning conventions while studying. Opposition will occur because of differing notions of what constitutes classroom learning. From an Asian point-of-view, very little must change relative to prior classroom learning experiences because the classroom and students are Asian. From a western point-of-view, the native English-speaking teacher (NEST) and the communicative approach to language teaching he or she instructs with should be accommodated. As a result, Asian EFL students are faced with definitive cultural barriers. Foremost, is the stereotype that they are confronted with when they are labeled as reticent in the classroom (Lee, & Ng, 2010). In such a situation, EFL teachers will characterize their classrooms as "silent" or their students as "passive and reticent" because of the comparisons made to western models used as a cultural yardstick.

In sum, the daily cross-cultural language learning experience of international students may extend students' probable cultural barriers of acculturation, culture shock, social distance past the original confines of the academic setting and into a student's social and professional life as well. Problems with acculturation may result from stress caused through encountering the target culture, and it will progressively abate as the learner becomes more empathetic with persons in the target culture. Culture shock results from an underlying insecurity about communicative competence which may be mitigated through familiarity and orientation. Consequently, the problem of social distance occurs because of the learner's own perceptions of personal understanding and acceptance.

Further, cultural barriers exist in resistance to imposed cultural norms, inability to assimilate, and passive-aggressive behaviors resulting from reactions to all-of-the-above. These individual and group impressions will be eliminated gradually as the EFL learner finds social solidarity between his or her own culture and that of the target culture.

4. Crossing Cultural Barriers for EFL Students

To bridge communication gaps, Cheng (2000)suggested that teachers should provide students with "a necessary support" and allow learners the opportunity to plan before they produce. Tsui (1996) advised that students should "check their answers with their peers before offering them up to the whole class" (p. 160) as a means to encourage students to speak up. Similarly, a small-group discussion among peers may also engender more confidence among the students prior to large-scale classroom discussion. Kojima (2004)further suggested the inclusion of *realia* (i.e. authentic materials in illustrative examples) in the classroom, outside language activities (i.e. suggested ESL/EFL websites, creation of school web-pages, and corresponding with key-pals), and studying for a purpose (i.e., standardized examinations such as IELTS, TOEIC, TOEFL, and STEP), would help increase interest in classroom participation.

Many studies have been conducted to determine how cultural barriers in the EFL classroom might be overcome through a variety of interventions and classroom teaching innovations. Aljumah (2011) investigated the communicative barriers for about 500 Saudi Arabian students' experienced in their unwillingness to speak over a five-year (i.e. since 2006) study of EFL/ESL university classrooms in Saudi Arabia. This qualitative study focused on the preferred feedback mechanisms students used by "teaming up with friends" (ibid., p. 87) during classroom activities. The study attributed the results to the length of the study and the number of participants involved. The in-depth nature of practical and integrative teaching procedures to eliminate barriers was never fully explored, and it was simply hinted at.

In a study of whether or not inclusion of the CLT approach in the EFL classroom affected the elimination of cultural barriers, Nakatani (2005) divided 62 Japanese female learners of English into two groups: an experimental group (EG) and a control group (CG). In an analysis of the research data, he found that the EG participants in the study significantly improved their oral proficiency test scores but the CG participants did not. As a result, Nakatani claimed that CLT strategies instruction provided the best treatment of remediation of reticence. Nataatmadja, Sixsmith, and Dyson (2007)interviewed 20 academicsfrom a Faculty of Information Technology at an AustralianUniversity and conducted focus group interviews of 36 local and Asian students. Several culturaland linguistic factors were identified and several strategies for improving classparticipation were suggested. These strategies included teachers addressing students' communication anxiety directly, using games and simulations during teaching, and explicit teaching of foreign language learning strategies themselves. Lee (2009) suggested that by giving pre-written verbal responses could overcome communication barriers because EFL students would be able to enhance their spoken classroom participation until they could initiate the same on an impromptu basis. According to Nation (2000), language instructors can create multiple opportunities for students to make use of background knowledge and experiences with strategies. Communicative skills and performance techniques involving these culture-based strategies may be pre-taught to guide students in accomplishing the tasks they will encounter in class. In sum, teachers have to understand culture and language learning, be able to describe cultural barriers that exist for EFL students, and to show EFL students how to cross these cultural barriers using the means at their disposal.

5. Introduction to the CSESP Teaching Program

The 16-week CSESPteaching program used in this study was implemented in three stages. In the first stage, the preparation stage, the instruments for the study were applied or generated, including the teaching materials, worksheets, assessment forms and criteria, and questionnaires. The proposed teaching and assessment procedures to be used was discussed or determined by the instructor involved in this study and feedback was solicited from peer instructors. Also, a pilot study was conducted to ensure the reliability and validity of relevant instrumentation, and to make appropriate modifications as needed.

In the second stage of this study, the subjects were divided because of cohort into two groups, an EG and a CG. Both groups possessed similar communication skills instruction, but with slight differences in speaking and assessment processes. Before regular English speaking content instruction, the *English Speaking Pretest* was administered to both groups of subjects.

Then independent-samples *t*-tests were applied to control the variable of English speaking proficiency of the subjects of both groups. To ensure the inter-reliability of the assessment of these study elements, two separate raters were employed to score the *English Speaking Pretest* conducted with both groups. In addition, a*Pretest* questionnaire was provided for the EG and the CG before the treatment in order to determine their exposure to an English speaking communication anxiety level. The EG and the CG were provided with the same English speaking material throughout the study, but they were graded to perform English speaking differently. The EG students were further scaffolded in group discussions, and role play simulations using the oral cultural assimilator (OCA) models, and also in their oral presentations. The subjects in the EG received explicit instruction in personal awareness of expected classroom participation behaviors and then in methods that assisted in the development of learner autonomy. Meanwhile, the CG received only the regular classroom instructional content without the inclusion of scaffolded or learner autonomy treatment.

The EG and the CG were provided with similar classroom instructions, but they were exposed to different speaking and assessment processes. That is, both groups of subjects were provided with many of the identical instructional settings and tasks to accomplish, except for slight differences, such as self-assessments, peer assessments, group discussions, and video and aural exercises were aimed at intercultural and participatory aspects of classroom behavior. Both groups used the same texts, provided as handout materials by the instructor's selection.

In the third stage of the study, the EG and the CG were asked to take the *English Speaking Post-test* and once again independent samples *t*-test was applied to compare both groups' English speaking performance. In addition, the*Post-test* questionnairewas applied once again in the EG and CG groups to determine their awareness levels of the multi-focus aspects of this study after the treatments took place. Subsequently, audio-recorded, face-to-face interviews were conducted and then with ten EG and ten CG subjects to provide qualitative data related to this study's findings. Finally, the collected data was analyzed.

5.1 Comparison between the CG's and the EG's Responses to the Target Culture in the CSESP

This section presents the statistic results of the CG's and the EG's' responses to the *Pre-study* and *Post-study* questionnaire. The independent-samples *t*-test analysis was applied to compare the CG's and EG's responses to English speaking culture after the CSESP. The results of the analysis are discussed quantitatively and qualitatively. The statistical results are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

As illustrated in Table 1, there are no significant differences in the subjects' responses to Items 1-15 of the questionnaire as related to the target culture and English learning after the CSESP. The average mean scores of responses to Items 1-15 of the CG (3.64) and those of the EG (3.75) are respectively above 3.0. It shows that both the CG and the EG had positive responses to the target culture after CSESP. Likewise, the result derived from the mean scores of the responses to the two groups is considered to also be positive since they are both above 3.5.The result shows that both the EG and CG subjects considered cultural content to be of value in effectively learning how to speak more English after the study. The results contradict with the CSESP's thesis that the use of intercultural content in an English speaking class helps them develop English speaking skills.

5.2 Comparison between the CG's and the EG's Responses to Reticence after the CSESP

As shown in Table 2, there is a significant difference for the EG's and the CG's responses to Item 21 ($t = 2.00$, $p = .050 \leq .05$). For instance, the EG felt their lack of English language ability inhibited meaningful speaking and participation in the EFL classroom after the CSESP. The response is consistent with Liu's (2009) study finding indicated that "low English proficiency was the greatest contributor to university students' reticence in English language lessons" (p. 160). This claim was also made by the students' responses to the semi-structured interview provided as part of this research.

In sum, the overall statistical analysis result indicates that the CSESP provided the CG and the EG with an opportunity to realign their initial response to English speaking in an intercultural context. However, the CSEPS did not have a significant effect because the CG and the EG were exposed to the CSESP for too brief a period of time. Without affirmation and supportive language skills environment afforded by scaffolded English speaking instruction, the CG would quickly revert to the non-communicative or reticent individuals they were at the beginning of this study.

The following excerpts of one of the student responses to an item on the *Interview Form*provide additional information and explanation related to study participants' feelings of reticence based on feelings of language non-proficiency in the EFL classroom setting.

I am not sure what I am talk is correct; so I don't say nothing (sic). (EG Student – 3)

I think they are similar with me. They just don't want to say because their English is also not good. (CG Student – 11)

As seen from the excerpts, EG Student – 3 stated that he was uncertain about the correctness of what he was saying, so as a result this student chose to say nothing and to remain silent during class discussion. This choice can easily lead to a misunderstanding with the teacher since active oral classroom participation is strongly encouraged in modes of western teaching similar to that of the CSESP. The teacher may view silence as the student's failure since the stated purpose of the class is to speak and to actively participate. The above excerpt for EG Student - 11 shows that EG and CG participants were often self-deprecating or under-rated their overall English proficiency or spoken English proficiency. These feelings of inadequacy had the effect of producing anxiety which lead to reticence. In addition, EG Student – 3 voiced concern about correctness is supported Price's (1991) study of Chinese-speaking university students'English speaking reticence.

Non-participation in classroom activities may or may not be evidence of reticent behavior. Likewise, it has been well established (Horwitz, et al., 1986) that communication anxiety was made up of communication anxiety and a self-evident nervous predisposition. The general effect of implementing CSESP instruction in the EFL classroom was to promote participation through a carefully scaffolded learning environment that would hopefully create ample opportunities for speech output in the target language, English. The increased opportunities and method of instruction were intended to reduce reticence through focusing on task and accomplishment rather than on assessment and formal presentation.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

There is only one significant difference in their responses to the target culture between the EG and the CG subjects in the CSESP. In addition, the higher mean score of the CG than that of the EG, they show that both the EG and the CG subjects in the CSESP liked learning culture in the CSESP. To be specific, they liked to compare my own culture with others in the English classroom. For instance, students would often include comments about real examples of the kind of intercultural experiences they experienced with foreign friends and guests at the school's hotel and restaurant. In addition, they liked to share intercultural experiences based on travel abroad with others in the English classroom. For instance, several of the students had experienced homestays in Canada and the U.S. They were encouraged to share their experiences of celebrations and holidays and to compare them with the local variety.

References

Adler, P. S. (1987). Culture shock and the cross-cultural learning experience. In L. F. Luce,& E. C. Smith (Eds.), *Toward internationalism: Readings in cross-cultural communication* (2nd ed., pp. 24-35). Cambridge, MA: Newbury.

Aljumah, F. (2011).Developing Saudi EFL students' oral skills: An integrative approach.*English Language Teaching, 4*(3), 16-42.

Belchamber, R. (2008). The advantages of communicative language teaching.*The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved January 14, 2012, from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Belchamber-CLT.html

Black, K. (2004). A review of factors which contribute to the internationalization of a program of study.*Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, and Tourism Education, 3*(1), 5-18. Retrieved October 27, 2012, from http://dx.doi.org/10.3794/johlste.31.51

Breen, M. (2001). The social context for language learning: A neglected situation. In C.N. Candlin, & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in a social context: A reader* (pp. 122-44). London: Routledge.

Byram, M. (1997).*Teaching and the assessing of intercultural competence.*Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cheng, X.T. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited.*System, 28*(3), 435-446.

Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.),*Culture in second language teaching* (pp. 196-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Debashish, B. (2010). Asian students' perceived passivity in the ESL/EFLclassroom. *Language in India, 10*(10), 150-179.

Duckworth, E. (1987). *'The having of wonderful ideas' and other essays on teaching and learning*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Fu, D.L. (1991). A process class room through the eyes of an outsider. *Language Arts, 68*, 121-123.

Gordon, E. (Ed.) (1964).*Review of research in education*. Washington: AERA.

Hall, J.K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: the development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137-151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J.K., &Verplaeste, L.S. (Eds.) (2000) *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction.*Mahwah, N.J.: LawrenceErlbaum.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986).Foreign language classroom anxiety.*The Modern Language Journal,70*(ii), 125-132.

Kachru, Y.,& Nelson, C. (2006). World Englishes in Asian contexts. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Teacher identified factors affecting theimplementation of an EFL innovation in Greek public secondaryschools. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 8*(1), 53-68.

Kim, Y.Y. (1991). Intercultural communication competence: A systems-theoretic view. In S. Ting-Toomey, &F. Kerzennyi (Eds.), *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*(pp. 259-275). Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

Kim, Y. Y. (1992, May). Development of intercultural identity. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Miami FL.

Kim, Y.Y. (1997). Intercultural personhood: An integration of Eastern and Western perspectives. In L. A. Samovar, & R.E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (*8th ed.*, pp. 434-447), Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth.

Kim, Y.Y. (2001). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation.* London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kojima, K. (2004). Getting reticent students involved in communicative English classes. *Takamatsu National College of Technology Journal, 39*, 71-79.

Kramsch, C. (1993).*Context and culture in language teaching.*Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lee, G. (2009). Speaking up: Six Korean students' oral participation in class discussionsin U.S. graduate seminars.*English for Specific Purposes*, *28*, 142-156. Retrieved on April 10, 2012, from doi:10.1016/j.esp.2009.01.007, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.01.007

Lee, W.,& Ng, S. (2010). Reducing student reticence through teacher interaction strategy.*ELT Journal Advance Access*.doi:10. 1093/elt/ccp080.

Liu, J. (2001). *Asian students' classroom communication patterns in U.S. universities: An emic perspective.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.

McDermott, R.,&Gospodinoff, K. (1981). Social contexts for ethnic borders and school failure.InH. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & G. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bi-lingual classroom*(pp.212-230). Rowley, MA: NewburyHouse.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising instruction on oral communication strategyuse.*The Modern Language Journal*, *89*, 76–91.doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2005.00266.x

Nataatmadja, I., Sixsmith, A., & Dyson, L.E. (2007). *Improving class participation byAsianstudents.* Paper presented at the 2007 IRMA International Conference.

Nation, I.S.P. (2000). Creating, adapting and using language teaching techniques. *English Language Institute Occasional Publication No. 20.* Victoria, University of Wellington.

Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environment. *Practical Anthropology, 7*, 177-182.

On, L. W. (1996). The cultural context for Chinese learners: Conceptions of learning in the Confucian tradition. In D. Watkins, & J.B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 25-41). Camberwell, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: ACER.

Parry, K. & Su, X. (Eds.) (1998). *Culture, literacy, and learning English: Voices from the Chinese classroom.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Boynton & Cook.

Price, M.L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety: Interviews with highly anxious students. In E.K. Horowitz,& D.J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 101-108). Trenton, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Richards, J. C.,& Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics (3rd ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Ltd.

Teske, R. H. C., & Nelson, B. H. (1974). Acculturation and assimilation: A clarification. *American Ethnologist*, 1(2), 351–367. doi: 10.1525/ae.1974.1.2.02a00090

Ting-Toomey, S. (1985).Toward a theory of conflict and culture. In W. B. Gudykunst, L. B. Stewart, & S. Ting-Toomey(Eds.), *Communication, culture, and organizational processes* (pp. 71-86). Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage.

Tsai, T. H. (2007). *Taiwanese educators' perspective on theimplementation of the new English education policy.*Unpublisheddoctoral dissertation, Alliant International University.

Tsui, A.B.M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M.Bailey,& D. Nunan (Eds.),*Voices from the language classroom*(pp. 145-167). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Upton, T. A. (1989). Chinese students, American universities, and cultural confrontation.*Minnesota TESOL Journal, 7*, 9-28.

Table 1: Comparison of the CG's and the EG's Responses to the Target Culture in the CSESP

Item	Group	N	M	SD		
1. Culture is an interesting topic for my English learning.						
	CG	29	3.90	.77		
					1.229	.225
	EG	24	4.17	.82		
2. Culture is a practical topic for my English learning.						
	CG	29	3.86	.74		
					.716	.477
	EG	24	4.00	.66		
3. I like to compare my own culture with others in the English classroom.						
	CG	29	3.62	.94		
					.335	.739
	EG	24	3.71	.96		
4. I like to share my culture with others in the English classroom.						
	CG	29	3.41	.87		
					1.472	.147
	EG	24	3.75	.79		
5. Cultural activities increase my motivation to learn English.						
	CG	29	3.62	.90		
					1.882	.066
	EG	24	4.08	.88		
6. Cultural activities help prepare for my professional careers.						
	CG	29	3.86	.69		
					.796	.430
	EG	24	4.04	.91		
7. Cultural activities can help improve my English Learning.						
	CG	29	3.90	.87		
					.864	.392
	EG	24	4.08	.83		
8. Singing English songs helps broaden my knowledge of the target culture.						
	CG	29	4.13	.64		
					1.560	.125
	EG	24	4.42	.65		
9. Cultural activities help increase my participation in class discussions.						
	CG	29	3.72	.70		
					1.65	.104
	EG	24	4.04	.69		
10. Cultural activities help increase my interests in English learning.						
	CG	29	3.93	.70		
					-.280	.780
	EG	24	3.88	.74		
11. The more cultural shocks I have, the worse I learn English.						
	CG	29	2.86	1.09		
					-1.054	.297
	EG	24	2.58	.83		
12. I regard cultural shocks as barriers for my English learning.						
	CG	29	3.10	.67		
					-1.899	.063
	EG	24	2.75	.68		
13. I hope my teachers can interpret cultural shocks in English classes.						
	CG	29	3.52	.99		
					-.819	.417
	EG	24	3.33	.64		
14. I can figure out some cultural shocks by observing.						
	CG	29	3.55	.83		
					.722	.474
	EG	24	3.71	.75		
15. I can figure out some cultural shocks by reading.						
	CG	29	3.55	.63		
					.775	.443
	EG	24	3.71	.81		
Overall	CG	29	3.64			
	EG	24	3.75			

*Note.*1. N = Sample Size, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation2. *Significance level< .05

Table 2: Comparison of the CG's and the EG's Responses to Reticence after the CSESP

Item	Group	N	M	SD		
16. I'm afraid to speak up in English conversations.						
	CG	29	3.14	1.25		
					1.06	.294
	EG	24	3.48	1.13		
17. I avoid group discussions.						
	CG	29	3.76	1.02		
					1.17	.247
	EG	24	4.04	.74		
18. In class, I feel nervous when I have to speak to others in English.						
	CG	29	2.69	1.34		
					1.60	.116
	EG	24	3.20	1.00		
19. In the English class, I prefer to listen to rather than to speak in English.						
	CG	29	2.38	1.05		
					1.16	.251
	EG	24	2.68	.85		
20. The possibility of "losing face" whenever I speak English prevents me from speaking.						
	CG	29	2.83	1.10		
					.323	.748
	EG	24	2.92	1.00		
21. My English ability prevents me from speaking and participating in class.						
	CG	29	2.69	1.00		
					2.00	.050*
	EG	24	3.24	1.01		
22. In class, I speak only when the teacher speaks to me first.						
	CG	29	2.52	1.06		
					.422	.675
	EG	24	2.64	1.08		

*Note.*1. N = Sample Size, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation 2. *Significance level≤ .05